

### REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action dated June 29, 2004. Claims 39, 45 to 56, 58, 59 and 65 are pending in the application, with Claim 57 having been cancelled. Claims 39, 47 to 49, 51 to 53, 55, 56 and 58 have been amended. Claim 39 is the sole independent claim. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 39, 45 to 50 and 52 to 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,550,576 (Klosterman), Claim 51 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Klosterman in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,686,954 (Yoshinbo), Claims 58 and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as over Klosterman in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,801,787 (Schein), and Claim 65 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Klosterman. Claim 57 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter and without conceding the correctness of its rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the remaining claims are respectfully requested.

The present invention generally concerns receiving data. A television signal is received, and first and second program information data are entered which indicate information relating to a same program. According to one feature of the invention, integrated program information data is produced by extracting program data from the second program information data and complementing the first program information data with the extracted program data, based on desired program information designated from the first and second program information data.

By virtue of this arrangement, where integrated program information data is produced by extraction from the second program information data and complementation of the first, redundancy in displayed information is reduced.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 39 as amended is directed to a reception apparatus including reception means for receiving a television signal, input means for entering first program information data and second program information data which indicate information relating to a same program, and designation means for designating desired program information from the first program information data and the second program information data entered by the input means. The reception apparatus also includes integration means for producing integrated program information data by extracting program data from the second program information data and complementing the first program information data with the extracted program data, based on the desired program information designated by the designation means. In addition, the reception apparatus includes display means for displaying the integrated program information data in a display frame.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the invention of the subject application. In particular, the Klosterman, Yoshinbo and Schein patents are not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature that integrated program information data is produced by extracting program data from the second program information data and complementing the first program information data with the extracted program data, based on desired program information designated from the first and second program information data.

As understood by Applicants, Klosterman teaches the merging of television schedule information received from multiple sources for display on a grid guide. See Klosterman, Abstract. When multiple sources are used for receiving television channels, an overlap of channels sometimes occurs. In the case where two of the same channel are provided by different sources, a user can determine whether to have one of the channels, both of the channels, or neither of the channels displayed in the grid guide. The user's choice is entered into a coordinator via a remote control. See Klosterman, column 6, lines 34 to 56.

Although Klosterman teaches the merging of television schedule information received from multiple sources, it is not seen to teach that the information displayed is based on desired program information designated from first and second program information data. Rather, a user in Klosterman merely designates whether one, two, or none of the channels should be displayed, without necessarily designating what information is desired from the first and second program information data. Moreover, Klosterman is not seen to teach that such desired information is extracted from the second program information data to complement the first program information data.

In its rejection of now-cancelled Claim 57, the Office Action cited to column 7, lines 19 to 38 of Klosterman, which describes that a user can display additional information associated with a particular show, such as a short description of that show. This additional information is displayed as an overlay, a pull-down window or as a defined information window at the top or bottom of the screen.

However, the presentation of additional information in Klosterman is not seen to be the same as the claimed display of integrated program information data. The

additional information of Klosterman is seen to be secondary to information already being displayed. As such, the additional information is presented as an overlay, pull-down window or at the top or bottom of the screen, so as not to interfere with existing data. By contrast, the present invention produces integrated program information data by extracting program data from the second program information data and complementing the first program information data with the extracted program data. It is the integrated information that is displayed in the present invention, rather than a layering of additional information onto existing display data as described in Klosterman. Since Klosterman does not produce integrated data in this manner, Klosterman is also not seen to suggest the attendant benefits that such production of integrated data would provide, including a reduction in redundancy of displayed information.

In maintaining its rejection of the claims, the Office Action indicated that eliminating redundant information is not recited in the rejected claims. It is true that the elimination of redundant information is not recited in the claims. However, the claims have been amended to specify the way in which integrated data is produced. Since Klosterman does not produce integrated data in this way, it is not seen to obtain the benefits that the present invention provides for.

Yoshinbo and Schein have also been reviewed and are not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Klosterman.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claim 39 as amended is believed to be allowable over the applied references.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same

reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Regarding a formal matter, it is respectfully requested to receive an initialled copy of the Form PTO-1449 that was submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement dated July 27, 2004.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael K. O'Neill", is written over a horizontal line.

Michael K. O'Neill  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 86481v1